UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,863	01/29/2004	Jose L. Martinez	245597US-30	2634
	7590 03/28/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE ST	REET	SMALLEY, JAMES N		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3781		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/28/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/765,863	MARTINEZ, JOSE L.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JAMES N. SMALLEY	3781	

	JAMES N. SMALLEY	3781	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS .	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ig date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 ^o 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	16 and 41.33(a)).		OTOL 224)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 			,
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 28-31.	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>20-31.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-27</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•	
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Anthony D Stashick/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3781			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment to overcome the outstanding Restriction by Original Presentation to now claim the material layer being disposed on an outermost layer of the inner surface is a new issue as it was not previously considered. .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claims 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Garza '445 in view of Kunimoto '100 is still proper. Examiner notes the claim is only drawn to the cap, and not to the combination of the cap and the container. In order to properly reject claim 28, the prior art must only teach a closure cap which includes a non-wetting means. It is the Examiner's position that Kunimoto '100 teaches liner 9 in column 5, lines 51-55 could be formed of "an olefin resin such as polyethylene, an ethylene-vinyl acetate copolymer or an ethylene-propylene copolymer or a soft vinyl chloride resin." Examiner asserts at the very least that polyethylene will repel water or is at the very least capable of repelling water, because water will not be absorbed in mass quantities if at all by the liner. Regarding claim 30, Examiner notes that the figures of the Applicant's invention all show liners of similar structural composition as that of Kunimoto '100. Thus, the liner of Kunimoto '100 when applied to the cap of Garza '445, will be as "linerless" as that of the instant invention. Furthermore, even if the claimed limitation were to refer to a mere coating, such could still be considered a liner.